

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview dated April 5, 2010, in which the restriction requirement in the Office Action dated April 1, 2010, was discussed. The Examiner agreed that it was not proper to issue a restriction requirement when there was only one claim (claim 37). Applicant noted that a restriction requirement is proper only if there are multiple claims directed to multiple inventions. In this case, when the Office Action was issued, there was only one claim (claim 37) pending in the application, so a restriction requirement was not proper.

Applicant has reinstated claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 15-17, 19-26, 35, 36, and amended them to depend on claim 37.

The rejection of claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. 112 is moot in view of the claim amendments.

Canceled claims have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner. Any circumstance in which the applicant has made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims. Any circumstance in which the applicant has amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 29, 2010 _____

/Rex I. Huang/ _____
Rex I. Huang
Reg. No. 57,661

Customer Number 26161
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945
22448033.doc